



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

firearms, had embedded a bullet from the contrivance in an oaken table in the courtroom, and they had seen the effect and could not say that the toy was not a dangerous weapon. In *Mathews v. Caldwell*, 63 *Southeastern Reporter*, 250, the Georgia Court of Appeals, remarking that jurors are chosen, not only for uprightness, but also for intelligence, being able to bring into the box knowledge of the common things of life, decided that they were qualified to look at this mechanical creation, and to determine whether it was a firearm.

---

**"Three Weeks" is Indecent and Impure.**—Defendant was convicted of selling a certain printed book, entitled "Three Weeks," alleged to contain obscene, indecent, and impure language manifestly tending to the corruption of the morals of youth. The characters in the book were involved in what would be termed illicit relations in law, but were designated as "love" by the author. In *Commonwealth v. Buckley*, 86 *Northeastern Reporter*, 910, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts sustained the judgment, concluding that an author who raises the curtains of the adulterous bed can find no fault if the jury say that not the spiritual but the animal, not the pure but the impure, will appear most conspicuously to the general reader. It may be that the literary style of the book is such that many a reader finds that the most attractive feature, and the thinly veiled allusions to the desire for sexual intercourse and to the arts of seduction leading to it may be unheeded by him, but the reading public as a whole will probably not so regard it.

---

**Forcible Entry of Athletic Club by Police.**—The eagerness of several policemen to nip mischief in the bud led them to force their way at unexpected intervals, without warrants, into the premises of an athletic club. They insisted that conduct of illegal sparring exhibitions justified their unannounced calls. On one occasion, when no such exhibition was occurring, their entrance, and their obnoxious and persistent presence, interrupted a business meeting. The New York Supreme Court in *Fairmount Athletic Club v. Bingham*, 113 *New York Supplement*, 905, remarked that police have no right to enter private houses or clubs, and their act was one in defiance of law. As it would be quite impossible to estimate in an action at law the damages to a social club like the plaintiff by reason of its being forced to disband because of police oppression, defendants will be enjoined from further entrance without a warrant, except when a misdemeanor is being committed.

---

**Retarding of Fire Department by Train of Cars.**—The fire department, while hurrying to extinguish a conflagration, was delayed for about 30 minutes by a train of cars which had been left standing

across a street. During this time the house of respondent took fire from one near it. In *Houren v. Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. Co.*, 86 *Northeastern Reporter*, 611, the railroad was sued for the destruction of respondent's house, which it was alleged was caused by the inability of the fire engines to reach it in time. It was contended that the fire, and not the obstruction of the street, was the proximate cause of the destruction of the building, and that there was no proof that the firemen would have been able to prevent its demolition had the delay not occurred. The Illinois Supreme Court held that the obstruction was a concurrent cause of the burning, and that, although absolute proof of the result of the efforts of the fire department could not be offered, it was reasonable to expect that it would have been able to prevent the spread of flames, especially as all the paraphernalia for fire protection was available.